BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. CC 2012-175

JASON KENNETH PETERS 2672 SE Flavia Ter., Port Saint Lucie, FL 34952 Optometrist License No. 10967 OAH No. 2014060121

Respondent.

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby adopted by the State Board of Optometry, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision in this matter.

This Decision shall become effective on September 17, 2014

It is so ORDERED August 18, 2014

FOR THE STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

	•
KAMALA D. HARRIS	
Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
Deputy Attorney General	
Los Angeles, CA 90013	
Telephone: (213) 897-2564	
Attorneys for Complainant	
	RE THE
	OF OPTOMETRY CONSUMER AFFAIRS
	CALIFORNIA
]
In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. CC 2012-175
JASON KENNETH PETERS	OAH No. 2014060121
26/2 SE Flavia Ter., Port Saint Lucie, FL 34952	STIPULATED SURRENDER OF
	LICENSE AND ORDER
Optometrist License No. 10967	
Respondent.	
IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGI	REED by and between the parties to the above-
entitled proceedings that the following matters a	re true:
PAR	CTIES
1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the State Board of	
by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the St	ate of California, by Gillian E. Friedman, Deputy
Attorney General.	
2. Jason Kenneth Peters (Respondent)	is represented in this proceeding by attorney
Adam B. Brown, whose address is Law Offices	
$M \rightarrow 0$	
	Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General GilLIAN E. FRIEDMAN Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 169207 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2564 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 Attorneys for Complainant BEFORE STATE BOARD DEPARTMENT OF C STATE OF C In the Matter of the Accusation Against: JASON KENNETH PETERS 2672 SE Flavia Ter., Port Saint Lucie, FL 34952 Optometrist License No. 10967 Respondent. IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGI entitled proceedings that the following matters at PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) is the logotometry. She brought this action solely in her by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the St Attorney General. 2. Jason Kenneth Peters (Respondent)

3. On or about September 9, 1997, the State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist License No. 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters. The Optometrist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. CC 2012-175 and expired on December 31, 2013.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. CC 2012-175 was filed before the State Board of Optometry (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on February 12, 2014. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. CC 2012-175 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. CC 2012-175. Respondent also has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel, at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

8. Respondent understands that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. CC 2012-175, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Optometrist License.

1Ó

.

- 9. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest that cause for discipline exists based on those charges.
- 10. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to issue an order accepting the surrender of his Optometrist License without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 11. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the State Board of Optometry. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the State Board of Optometry may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and surrender, without notice to or participation by Respondent or his counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Surrender and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 12. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 13. This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is intended by the parties to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement. It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions, negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.

14. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Optometrist License No. 10967, issued to Respondent Jason Kenneth Peters, is surrendered and accepted by the State Board of Optometry.

- 1. The surrender of Respondent's Optometrist License and the acceptance of the surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the State Board of Optometry.
- 2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as an optometrist in California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.
- 3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.
- 4. If Respondent ever files an application for licensure or a petition for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked license in effect at the time the petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. CC 2012-175 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the petition.
- 5. Respondent shall pay the agency its costs of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$4,427.50 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license.
- 6. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license, by any other health care licensing agency in the State of California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation, No. CC 2012-175 shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.

27 | ///

28 | ///

ŀ

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Adam B. Brown. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Optometrist License. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the State Board of Optometry.

7

8 DATE

7/24/14

JASON KENNETH PETERS

Respondent

I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Jason Kenneth Peters the terms and conditions and other matters contained in this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I approve its form and content.

13 DATED:

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

7/24/14

ADAM B. BROWN

Law Offices of Brown & Brown Attorney for Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the State Board of Optometry of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Dated: 7/28/14

Respectfully submitted.

KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General

GILLIAN E. FRIEDMAN
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

LA2013509785

51556241.doc

5

Stipulated Surrender of License (Case No. CC 2012-175)

Exhibit A

Accusation No. CC 2012-175

1 2 3 4 5 6	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General GILLIAN E. FRIEDMAN Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 169207 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2564 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
8	Attorneys for Complainant	DE THE
9	BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA
11	T. d. N. d. C.I. A	G NT- CC 2012 175
. 12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. CC 2012-175
13	JASON KENNETH PETERS 2672 SE Flavia Ter., Port Saint Lucie, FL 34952	ACCUSATION
14	Optometrist License No. 10967	ACCUSATION
15	Optomourist Election 100 1000	·
15	Respondent.	
16	Respondent.	
	Respondent.	
16 17 18	Respondent. Complainant alleges:	
16 17 18 19	Complainant alleges:	RTIES
16 17 18	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as
16 17 18 19 20 21	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist (Respondent). The Optometrist License was in
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters full force and effect at all times relevant to the classical complexity.	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist (Respondent). The Optometrist License was in
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters full force and effect at all times relevant to the cl 31, 2013 and has not be renewed. ///	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist (Respondent). The Optometrist License was in
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters full force and effect at all times relevant to the cl 31, 2013 and has not be renewed. /// ///	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist (Respondent). The Optometrist License was in
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings the Executive Officer of the State Board of Opto 2. On or about September 9, 1997, the License Number 10967 to Jason Kenneth Peters full force and effect at all times relevant to the cl 31, 2013 and has not be renewed. /// /// ///	this Accusation solely in her official capacity as ometry, Department of Consumer Affairs. State Board of Optometry issued Optometrist (Respondent). The Optometrist License was in

4-

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code ("Code") unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b) of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender, or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
 - 5. Section 490 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- "(c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code."
 - 6. Section 493 of the Code states:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially

related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question."

As used in this section, "license" includes "certificate," "permit," "authority," and "registration."

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

7. Section 3090 of the Code states:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, the board may take action against all persons guilty of violating this chapter or any of the regulations adopted by the board. The board shall enforce and administer this article as to licenseholders, and the board shall have all the powers granted in this chapter for these purposes, including, but not limited to, investigating complaints from the public, other licensees, health care facilities, other licensing agencies, or any other source suggesting that an optometrist may be guilty of violating this chapter or any of the regulations adopted by the board."

8. Section 3110 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

"The board may take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct, and may deny an application for a license if the applicant has committed unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter or any of the rules and regulations adopted by the board pursuant to this chapter.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions.

Accusation

1. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1517 states, in pertinent part:

"For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of the certificate of registration of an optometrist pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Code, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of an optometrist if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of an optometrist to perform the functions authorized by his/her certificate of registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare."

COST RECOVERY

12. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES/DANGEROUS DRUGS

- 13. "Benzodiazepine" is a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 11057(d) and a dangerous drug per Section 4022 of the Code. In general, benzodiazepines act as hypnotics in high doses, anxiolytics in moderate doses, and sedatives in low doses.
- 14. "Methamphetamine" is a Schedule II controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11055(d)(2) and a dangerous drug as designated by Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is a stimulant drug.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Conviction of a Substantially Related Crime)

15. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 3110, subdivision (k), and 490 of the Code, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1517 for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed optometrist.

- a. On July 31, 2013, after pleading nolo contendere, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23103, [reckless driving] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Jason K. Peters* (Super. Ct. Los Angeles County, 2013, No. 3vy03015). The Court placed Respondent on 36 months probation, with terms and conditions.
- b. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on June 20, 2013, Respondent was stopped while traveling on the 101 Freeway at a slow rate of speed with hazard lights activated. Respondent told the officer that he was going slow because he was transporting his pet fish. During the stop, Respondent was observed to be driving under the influence. Respondent submitted to a chemical blood test, which returned positive for Benzodiazepines and Methamphetamine.
- c. Respondent had a prior conviction for violating Vehicle Code section 23103, [reckless driving] on December 6, 2004 in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Jason K. Peters* (Super. Ct. Los Angeles County, 2004, No. 04HM08529).

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dangerous Use of Alcohol, Controlled Substances, and Dangerous Drugs)

16. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 3110, subdivision (l) for unprofessional conduct in that on or about June 20, 2013, Respondent used controlled substances, and dangerous drugs to an extent or in a manner dangerous or injurious to himself, another person, or the public. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 15 a through c above, as though set forth fully.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a license)

17. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 3110, subdivision (f) in that Respondent's action or conduct would have warranted the denial of a license.

Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporate, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 15 through c above, as though set forth fully.

///

-3

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violating or Attempting to Violate Provisions of the Chapter)

18. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 3110, subdivision (a) in that Respondent violated or attempted to violate, directly or indirectly assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter or any of the rules or regulations adopted by the board pursuant to this chapter. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporate, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 15 a through c above as though set forth fully.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct: Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 19. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 3110, subdivision (c) in that Respondent engaged in repeated negligent acts in connection with his work as an independent contractor at L.A. Optometrique, Doctors of Optometry, located at 8801 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, California.
- a. On July 16, 2012, August 23, 2012 and September 13, 2012, Respondent failed to show up for a fully booked schedule of patient appointments without any prior excuse or warning to the staff or his patients, requiring the patients to reschedule their appointments.
- b. On October 25, 2012, office staff noticed that Respondent appeared to be taking an extremely long time with his last scheduled patient of the day. After an hour into the exam, the patient walked out of the exam room without a prescription and left the office. Staff went into the exam room and found Respondent to have dilated pupils and appeared to be incoherent and lethargic. Respondent refused any medical attention and instead requested that staff call a friend to drive him home.
- c. On November 29, 2012, Respondent showed up at the office with dilated eyes and slurred speech, causing concern by the staff.
- d. On January 6, 2012, Respondent contacted the police and asked them to come to his home because he believed that there was a conspiracy of viruses on his computer, cellphone and

Accusation